

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
JONESBORO DIVISION**

**WALTER RAGLAND
ADC #138202**

PLAINTIFF

V.

CASE NO. 3:15-CV-00094 BSM/BD

A. HUCKABEE and JANE DOE

DEFENDANTS

RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION

I. Procedures for Filing Objections:

This Recommended Disposition (“Recommendation”) has been sent to Chief United States District Judge Brian S. Miller. You may file written objections to this Recommendation. If you file objections, they must be specific and must include the factual or legal basis for your objection. Your objections must be received in the office of the United States District Court Clerk within fourteen (14) days of this Recommendation.

If no objections are filed, Judge Miller can adopt this Recommendation without independently reviewing the record. By not objecting, you may also waive any right to appeal questions of fact.

II. Discussion:

On April 13, 2015, Walter Ragland, then an inmate at the Greene County Detention Facility (“Detention Facility”), filed this lawsuit pro se under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Court granted his application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”). (Docket entries #2, #6)

In his complaint, Mr. Ragland alleged that he was not provided adequate medical care while he was housed at the Detention Facility, but he sued the Defendants in their official capacity only. Because Mr. Ragland did not allege that he was injured as a result of any Greene County custom or policy, the Court allowed him thirty days to amend his complaint to remedy this defect. (#6)

Mr. Ragland did not file an amended complaint, but he did request a new § 1983 complaint form. (#8) In response, the Court directed the Clerk of the Court to send Mr. Ragland a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint form. Mr. Ragland was provided an additional thirty days to file his amended complaint.


Recently, Mr. Ragland's mail has been returned to the Court with a notation that it cannot be forwarded. (#11, #12) As a result, the Court gave Mr. Ragland until August 14, 2015, to provide the Court an updated address. The Court specifically warned Mr. Ragland that his claims could be dismissed if he failed to comply with the Court's order. (#13)

To date, Mr. Ragland has not filed an amended complaint; nor has he provided the Court an updated address as required by court rules. The time for complying with the Court's orders has passed.

III. Conclusion:

The Court recommends that Mr. Ragland's claims be DISMISSED, without prejudice, based on his failure to prosecute this lawsuit and to comply with court orders.

DATED this 18th day of August, 2015.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "P. J. [unclear]", is written above a horizontal line.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE